Strongylopus Tschudi, 1838 (Amphibia, Anura): request for the designation under the plenary powers of a type-species in agreement with current usage

Alain DUBOIS

Laboratoire des Reptiles et Amphibiens, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 25 rue Cuvier, 75005 Paris, France

A detailed analysis shows that, as a result of Opmon 713 (1964) of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenchature, the nominal genus Strongolygous Tschulu, 1838 does not have at present a type-species, and that the possible designations of type-species available under the Rules would result in momenclatural problems. The ICZN is therefore asked to use its pleany powers to designate for this genus a typesocies in agreement with current usage.

Note. — This paper was submitted on 8 September 1980 to the Secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for publication in the Bulletin of zoological Nomenclature, but, despite repeated requests since then, has still not been published in this journal. The problem it raised has therefore remained unresolved, which is unfortunate, especially when one considers that, since them, several papers and checklists mentioning the generic name Strongelpous have been published (Cher., 1981, Dubois, 1981 a, 1981 b, 1987, FROST, 1985; Duellman & Trueb, 1986), and others are in progress. This paper is therefore published here as it was submitted, except that a few more recent bibliographic references have been incorporated.

(1) After having long been considered a subjective synonym of the Amphibian generic name Rana Linnaeus, 1758, the name Srangulopus Tschudi, 1838 was resurrected as a valid generic name by Van Dijk (1966). Since then it has been used as a valid generic (Van Dijk, 1971, 1972). CHANNING & VAN DIJK, 1976; CHANNING, 1979; CLARKE, 1981; FROST, 1985; DILLILLIAM & TRUEB, 1986) or subgeneric (Dubous, 1981 a, 1981 b, 1987) mame by some authors, while others (Passange & Carrutters, 1979) still considered it as a synonym of Rana. It is likely that this name will remain in use, at least to designate a subgenus of the genus Rana s.l. However, evidence is below presented that the nominal genus Strongylopus Tschudi, 1838 does not at present have a type-species, and that the possible designations of type-species available under the Rules would result in nomenclatural problems. The Commission is therefore requested to use its plenary powers to designate a type-species for this nominal genus in agreement with current usage.

(2) The generic name Strongylopus was created by Tschubi (1838: 38, 78-79) for a single nominal species, "Rana fasciata Boie". As was shown by PARKER & RIDE (1962), BOIE

- (1832: 62) credited the name Rana fasciata to BURCHELL (1824: 32). Therefore the type-species of Strongylopus at its creation was Rana fasciata Burchell, 1824 by monotypy.
- (3) As a result of PARKER & RIDE's (1962) application and after the comments of SMTH (1963) and POYNTON (1963) about it, the Commission (Opinion 713; ANONYMOUS, 1964) decided to suppress the name Rana fasteata Burchell, 1824, as well as all other uses of the combination Rana fasteata prior to that by SMTH (1849), and to place the name Rana fasteata Smith, 1849 on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (4) It is clear that the generic name Strongylopus, coined in 1838, cannot have as its type-species by monotypy a nominal species created in 1849. Furthermore, TSCHUD1 (1838) based his genus Strongylopus on specimens in the Leiden Museum which presumably belonged to the species Rana gray Smith, 1849 and not to Rana Jascata Smith, 1849 (see PARKE & RIDE, 1962). In any case, both nominal species Rana Jascata and Rana gray date from SMITH's (1849) paper, and cannot be the type-species of Strongylopus by original monotypy; they cannot either be considered as originally included in this genus, at least not as from TSCHUD1's (1838) work. The genus Strongylopus is however available as of TSCHUD1 (1838), since based on a diagnosis. The only nominal species originally included in this genus having been suppressed by the Opinion 713, the result is the same as if this genus had been created without any nominal species included. Therefore the first author to have associated available specific names to the name Strongylopus has fixed the originally included species of this genus
- (5) DUMERIL & BIBRON (1841: 389) mention the combination Strongylopus fasciatus in the synonymy of Rana fasciata. This work is still anterior to the work of SMITH (1849) and, following the Opinion 713, the name Rana fasciata is still not available at that time.

As was noted by PARKER & RIDE (1962), SMITH (1849) had relied upon DUMÉRII. & BIBRON's (1841) work to define the species Rama Jasciana. He had restricted the use of this name to some of the specimens upon which DUMÉRII. & BIBRON had based their description of this species, and which were considered by them to constitute a particular variety, "Variété D", of this species.

While SMITH (1963) and HUBBS (in ANONYMOUS, 1964) are certainly correct in stating that a specific name, associated with a given species, should not be credited to an author to whom this given species was unknown, it may be regretted that, when voting on the Opinion 713 (see ANONYMOUS, 1964), the Commission was not proposed as a third alternative in the Part 2 of the vote to validate the name Rana fascata as of DUMÉRIL & BIBRON (1841) and to designate for this nominal species, rather than a neotype, a lectotype, chosen among the still extant specimens on which DUMÉRIL & BIBRON (1841) had based their description of Rana fascata. For this purpose, the specimen No. 396 in the Paris Museum collections, an adult female collected by Delalande in the Cape region, which belongs to DUMÉRIL & BIBRON's "Variété D" and which is a typical Rana fascata, would have been available. If this had been done, Rana fascata would be the type-species of Strongylopus by subsequent monotypy but, unless changes are brought to the Opinion 713, it cannot be the case.

(6) FITZINGER (1843: 31) mentioned "Strongyl. fascuatus Tschud" as type-species of Strongylopus, and GÜNTHER (1859: 20) quoted "Strongylopus fascuatus, Tschudi" in the synonymy of "Rana fascuata, Bose" Both these authors refer to a specific name, "fascuatus Tschudi" (= fascuata Burchell) which is not available as having been suppressed by the OpiDubois 71

nion 713, and therefore cannot be construed as having designated a type-species for Strongylopus or as having included a nominal species in this genus.

(7) The first author to have associated available specific names to Strongylopus is FIT-ZINGER (1860: 414), who wrote:

Rana fasciata Dum. Bıbr.)

"Strongylopus Delalandı: Fitz. (Rana Delalandıi Dum. Bibr.)

Cap.

Strongylopus fasciatus Tschudi (Rana fasciata Boie. -

Cap.

Strongylopus oxyrhynchus Fitz. (Rana oxyrhynchus Sundevall)

Cap."

The first of these three names, Rama dalalandi Duméril & Bibron, 1841 (nec Pyxtephalus dalalandit Tschudi, 1838), is a senior synonym of Rama angolensis Bocage, 1866 (see e.g. POYNTON, 1964: 103), and applies to a species of the subgenus or genus Rama s. str. The third name, Rama oxyrhymchus Smith, 1849, applies to a species of the subgenus or genus Prophada Boulenger, 1917 (see e.g. POYNTON, 1964: 124). As for the second name, it refers again to the suppressed name Rama Jascata Burchell, 1824 and is not available, all the more that SMITH'S Rama fasteatus is not even mentioned as a synonyme.

Therefore two nominal species only, Rana delalandu Duméril & Bibron, 1841 and Rana oxyrhynchus Smith, 1849 are to be considered as the species originally included in the genus Strongylopus Tschudi, 1838, and are the only two species eligible for type-fixation in this genus. The fact that later STEINDACHNER (1867 21-122) mentioned the names Rana grays Smith, 1849 (as a synonym of "Strongylopus grays Steind.") and Rana factacia Smith, 1849 (as a synonym of "Strongylopus fascatus Tschudi") is of no relevance here, since STEINDACHNER's work is largely posterior to FITZINGER's.

- (8) None of the two species originally included in Strongylopus belongs to the group to which this name is currently applied. If Rana delalandit Duméril & Bibron. 1841 was chosen as the type-species of Strongylopus, this name would disappear as a subjective junior synonym of Rana Linnaeus, 1758 (see e.g. DUBOIS, 1987. 42): this would have no other inconyment of the need of coning a new name for the group of frogs including Rana Jascaua Smith, 1849 and Rana gray Smith, 1849. If, on the other hand, Rana oxyrhynchus Smith, 1849 was chosen as the type-species of Strongylopus, this latter name should replace Pytchadena Boulenger, 1917 as the valid name of another subgenus or genus of African rands. This latter consequence would be most disturbing for the stability of nomenclature since the name Pytchadena has been regularly used since its creation.
- (9) In order to preserve the stability of nomenclature, an action of the Commission is necessary. Two possible actions may be contemplated.

The first one, which I strongly advocate, would be to revert to the Opinion 713 and to make the name Rana fascata available as of DUMERIL & BIBRON (1841); the specimen No. 396 in the Paris Museum would be designated as lectotype of this species and the designation of a neotype for Rana fascata made by PARKER & RIDE (1962) would be annulated; following this action, the species Rana fascata Duméril & Bibron, 1841 would automatically become the type-species of Strong/lopus Tschudi, 1838 by subsequent monotypy.

If the Commission refused to change the wording of the Opinion 713, the action to take would be to suppress all previous designations of type-species for *Strongiopus* Tschudi, 1838, and to designate a type-species for this genus under the plenary powers. The choice

of this type-species could again be a matter of discussion: one could advocate the choice of Rana grayi Smith, 1849, since this species, although under the name "Rana Jascata Boie", is likely to be the one on which TSCHUDI (1838) had based his genus Storgylopus; or one could advocate the choice of Rana fascata Smith, 1849, in order to follow previous designations (e.g. FITZINGER, 1843, PONNION, 1964 and FROST, 1985 mentioned "Rana fascataa" as the type-species of Storgylopus; Since Rana grayin and Rana fascataa are very closely related species (see e.g. PONNION, 1964 and PASSMORE & CARRUTHERS, 1979), any genus containing one of them is bound to contain also the other one, and both possible designations would be strictly equivalent in terms of generic content.

(10) Accordingly I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to settle the matters in this question, by choosing between the three following alternatives:

(a) Alternative A.

- (1) to use its plenary powers to change some parts of the Opinion 713; the following new wordings are to replace those which appear in the original Opinion under the same numbers:
- (1) (b) all other uses of the specific name fasciata, in the combination Rana fasciata, prior to that by DUMÉRIL & BIBRON, 1841;
- (2) (a) fascata Duméril & Bibron, 1841, as published in the binomen Rana fasciata, as interpreted by the specimen No. 396, in the Paris Museum collections, which is hereby designated as lectotype of this species (Name No. 2042);
- (3) (b) fasciata, all other uses of, in the combination Rana fasciata prior to that by DUMÉRIL & BIBRON, 1841 (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above) (Name No. 807);
- (2) to change the wordings of the entry No. 2042 in the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology and of the entry No. 801 in the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology according to (1) above;
- (3) to place the generic name Strongolopus Tschudi, 1838 (gender: masculine), type-species, by subsequent monotypy through DUMÉRII. & BIBRON (1841), Rana fascata Duméril & Bibron, 1841, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology

(b) Alternative B.

- to use its plenary powers to suppress all previous fixations of type-species for Strongylopus Tschudt, 1838 and to designate Rana grays Smith, 1849, as type-species of this genus;
- (2) to place the generic name Strongolopus Tschudt, 1838 (gender: masculine), type-species, by designation above in (1), Rana grays Smith, 1849, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

(c) Alternative C.

Same as Alternative B, but with Rana fasciata Smith, 1849 instead of Rana grayi Smith, 1849 designated as type-species of Strongylopus Tschudi, 1838.

Dubois 73

RÉSUMÉ

Une analyse détaillée permet de montrer que, par sutte de l'Opinion 713 (1964) de la Commission Internationale de Nomenclature Zoologique, le genre nommal Strongylopus Teschudı, 1838 ne possède pas à présent d'espèce-type, et que les désignations d'espèce-type actuellement possibles en fonction du Code entraîneraient des problèmes nomenclaturaux. En conséquence il est demandé à l'ICZN de faire usage de ses pleins pouvoirs pour désigner pour ce genre une espèce-type qui soit en accord avec l'usage actuel.

LITERATURE CITED

- ANONYMOUS, 1964. Opinion 713. Rana fasciata Smith, 1849 (Amphibia): added to the official list with suppression of Rana fasciata Burchell, 1824, under the plenary powers Bull. 2001. Nom., 21: 352-354.
- BOIE, H., 1832 Briefe von Heinrich Boie; geschrieben aus Ostindien und auf der Reise dahin Schleswig, Koniglichen Taubstummen Institut: 1-154
- BURCHELL, W. J., 1824. Travels in the interior of Southern Africa. Vol. II. London, Longman & Co.: i-viii + 1-648, pl. 1-10.
- CHANNING, A., 1979. Ecological and systematic relationships of Rana and Strongylopus in Southern Natal (Amphibia: Anura). Ann. Natal Mus. 23: 797-831
- CHANNING, A. & VAN DIJK, D. E., 1976. A guide to the frogs of South West Africa. Durban, University of Durban, Westville Press: 1-47.
- CLARKE, B. T., 1981 Comparative osteology and evolutionary relationships in the African Raninae (Anura Ranidae). Mont. zool. ital., (n. s.), 15, suppl.; 285-331.
- DUBOIS, A., 1981 a. Deux noms d'espèces préoccupés dans le genre Rana (Amphibiens, Anoures).
 Bull, Mus. natn. Hist. nat., (4), 2 (A): 927-931.
- ---- 1981 b Liste des genres et sous-genres nommaux de Ranoidea (Amphibiens, Anoures) du monde, avec identification de leurs espèces-types : conséquences nomenclaturales. Mont. zool. ital , (n. s.), 15, suppl. : 225-284.
 - --- 1987. Miscellanea taxinomica batrachologica (I). Alytes, 5: 7-95
- DUELLMAN, W. E. & TRUEB, L., 1986 Biology of Amphibians. New York, McGraw-Hill . 1-xix + 1-670
- DUMÉRIL, A.-M.-C. & BIBRON, G., 1841. Erpétologie generale ou histoire naturelle complète des Reptiles. Tome 8 Paris, Librairie encyclopédique de Roret : i-vii + 1-792.
- der Weltumsegelung Sr. Majestat Fregatte Novara. Staz -ber. kais. Akad. Wiss Wien, 42. 383-416.
- Frost, D. R. (ed.), 1985. Amphibian species of the world. Lawrence, Allen Press & Assoc. Syst. Coll. [i-iv] + i-v + 1-732.
- GÜNTHER, A., 1859. Catalogue of the Batrachia Sahentia in the collection of the British Museum. London, Taylor & Francis; 1-xv1 + 1-160, pl. I-XII.
- on, Taylor of Francis: Saylor 1-100, pt. FAIL.

 PARKER, H. W. & RIDE, W. D. L., 1962. Rana fastciaa Burchell, 1824 (Amphbia), proposed designation of a neotype under the plenary powers. Z. N (S.) 1253. Bull. zool. Nom., 19. 290-292.

 PASSMOKE, N. I. & CARRUTHERS, V. C., 1979. South African frogs. Johannesburg. Witwaterstand.
- University Press: 1-xviii + 1-270.

 POYNTON, J. C., 1963 Comment on the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate a neotype for Rana fascata Burchell, 1824. Z.N.(S.) 1253. Bull. 200 Now. 20: 255.
- ---- 1964. The Amphibia of Southern Africa : a faunal study. Ann. Natal Mus., 17 : 1-334

- SMITH, A., 1849. Illustrations of the Zoology of South Africa Repulsa. London, Smith, Elder & Coppl. 1-78, pp. 1-28 (Appendix).
- Ph. 1-78, pp. 1-28 (Appendix).
 SMITH, H. M., 1963 Comment on the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate a neotype for Rana fascata Burchell, 1824. Z.N.(S.) 1253. Bull. zool. Nom., 20: 254.
- STEINDACHNER, F., 1867 Reise der osterreichischen Fregatte Novara um die Erde in den Jahren 1857, 1858, 1859 unter den Befehlen des Commodore B. von Wullerstorf-Urbair. Zoologischer Theil. Bd
- 1. Amphibien. Wien, aus der Kaiserlich-Komiglichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei. 1 70, pl. 1-V TSCHUDI, J. 1, 1838. – Classification der Batrachier, mit Berücksichtigung der fossilen Thiere dieser Abtheilung der Repnitien. Neuchätel, Peturjerre: 1-102, pl. 1-V1.
- VAN DIJK, D. E., 1966. Systematic and field keys to the families, genera and described species of Southern African Anuran tadpoles. Ann. Natal Mus., 18: 231-286.
- ---- 1971 Anuran ecology in relation particularly to oviposition and development out of water Zool afr., 6: 119-132.
 - ---- 1972 The behaviour of Southern African Anuran tadpoles with particular reference to their ecology and related external morphological features. Zool. afr., 7: 49-55.